TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1534
Wednesday, December 12, 1984, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

(Moved from Langenheim)

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Connery	Higgins	Compton	Linker, Legal Department
Draughon	Paddock	Frank	Connelly, City Development
Kempe, Chairman	Young	Gardner	
Rice		Holwell	
VanFossen		Matthews	
Wilson, 1st Vice-Chairman		Wilmoth	
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, December 11, 1984, at 10:30 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Cherry Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve the Minutes of November 21, 1984 (No. 1531).

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve the Minutes of November 28, 1984 (No. 1532).

REPORTS:

Comprehensive Plan Committee Report:

Mr. VanFossen informed the Comprehensive Plan Committee met on this date and discussed the suggested Capital Improvement Projects for 1985, and the Turkey Mountain Special District Study with an additional meeting to be held in January.

Director's Report:

Mr. Compton presented a review of the City of Tulsa Capital Improvement Projects for FY 1985 and discussed their relationship to the Comprehensive Plan. He informed this is the annual review to see if these projects are in conformance with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and noted a memo in the Commission's packet which addresses the projects submitted to the Planning Commission Staff for review. He informed that all except three projects which were submitted, were in conformance and he presented copies of these projects (Exhibit "A-1"). Of those three projects discussed in the earlier Committee Meeting, the Virgin Street question was requested to be deleted by the City of Tulsa and would leave only two projects found not to be in conformance with the Major Street and Highway Plan. The Staff's recommendation to the Commission would be (a) find all of the projects submitted to the Planning Commission Staff as being in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan except for the Virgin Street, Independence Street and Mingo Road projects; (b) that the Virgin Street project be deleted from this list;

Director's Report: (continued)

(c) it be noted that the Independence Street and Mingo Road projects be found to be not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and if they are to be included in the CIP process, amending the Plan would be necessary.

Mr. Connelly updated the Planning Commission on the CIP requests and advised there are 62 new requests added to the list of about 80 requests that had not previously been funded, this totaling about 140 requests which would total over $1 billion. He informed most of these projects are expected to be completed within a 10-15 year time-frame and advised this inventory would serve current and future City requirements. He advised the projects would be ranked by the Greater Tulsa Council (Thursday) and by the Capital Coordinating Committee after being approved by the Planning Commission as being in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan and the list would be used to determine which projects would be included in future funding schedules. He also advised that four citizen meetings would be set up in January and one City-wide meeting in February to review these requests and obtain citizen input as to which projects are the most important and how they should be funded. The City Development Department, in conjunction with other City Departments would then develop a Five-year Capital Improvements Plan to fund these projects with the City Commission determining the best means of funding the projects.

Staff Recommendation:

The Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find all the proposed capital improvement projects in accord with the Comprehensive Plan except the Virgin Street Project, the Mingo Road Project and the Independence Street Project which are not in accord (Major Street and Highway Plan) with the Comprehensive Plan. The Virgin Street Project should be deleted and the Mingo Road and Independence Street Projects should be found to be not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and if they are to be included in the CIP process, amending the Major Street and Highway Plan would be necessary.

Discussion:

Mr. Connery advised he would abstain from voting as he did not feel that a 10-minute presentation gave him enough information for casting a vote. Ms. Kempe questioned Mr. Gardner if 6 affirmative votes would be required since this would perhaps require amending the Major Street and Highway Plan, and Mr. Gardner advised this would not be amending the Plan at this time, but only making a recommendation to the City Commission.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 5-0-1 (Draughon, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Connery, "abstaining"; Higgins, Paddock, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve the Staff Recommendation regarding Capital Improvement Projects for FY '85 finding all projects to be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, except deleting "Virgin Street Project", and finding that the "Mingo Road" and "Independence Street Projects" are not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Turkey Mountain Special Study

Presentation:

Ms. Matthews recapped the background on the Turkey Mountain Special Study to the Commission and advised the Staff had discussed this proposal with the representatives of District 8 and the Tulsa Airport Authority personnel and a draft of the proposal had been presented to the representatives of District 8 for their review. A briefing was held for the Comprehensive Plan Committee on November 7 with the Public Hearing being set for that date; however, the District 8 representatives requested a continuance so they could meet with their constituents. This meeting was held on November 28, and the representatives returned to the Staff with requested changes to the proposal, which have been responded to. These changes had been presented to the Comprehensive Plan Committee, as well as a request for continuance, requested by the District 8 representatives. Representatives of the Tulsa Airport Authority advised in the committee meeting that they would also like to have a continuance so the plan could be presented to its Joint Airport Zoning Board which meets later in December.

Discussion:

Ms. Kempe informed a request had been received from Mr. Ferris, Chairman of District 8 (Exhibit "B-1") for consideration of this Special District until January 30, 1985. Mr. VanFossen advised the Comprehensive Plan Committee met today and is recommending the approval of a continuance to January 30, for the hearing on this, recognizing the policy of the Planning Commission normally is for not more than two continuances.

Therefore, it is the expectation that the hearing will be held on January 30, and that any efforts by any of the other persons need to be taken place prior to this date. He also advised the Comprehensive Plan Committee is setting a meeting in this regard for January 23, at 12:00 noon for further discussion on this matter.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Rice, "abstaining"; Higgins, Paddock, Young, "absent") to continue to January 30, 1984, the Public Hearing to amend the District 8 Plan Map and Text by adding thereto the Turkey Mountain Special Study.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

PUD #383 Johnsen (Moulin Brant) North of the NE corner of 54th Street and Lewis Avenue OL

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen, attorney for the applicant, requested this item be withdrawn.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Young, "absent") to withdraw PUD #383 from consideration.

Applications No. Z-6017 and PUD #384 Present Zoning: (AG)
Applicant: Johnsen (H. A. Winders) Proposed Zoning: IR & IL
Location: South side of 71st Street and West of Arkansas River

Date of Application: October 18, 1984
Date of Hearing: November 12, 1984
Size of Tract: 9.75 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Roy Johnsen
Address: 324 Main Mall Phone: 585-5641

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-6017

The District 8 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity -- No Specific Land Use and Development Sensitive.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the requested IL and IR Districts are not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6017

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is 9.75 acres in size and located east of the southeast corner of 71st Street South and Elwood Avenue. It is partially wooded, sloping steeply, vacant and zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned AG, on the east by City of Tulsa Sewage Treatment Facility zoned AG, on the south mostly vacant property with some scattered single-family dwellings zoned AG, and on the west by vacant property zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Board of Adjustment approval has allowed a sewage disposal facility (Use Unit 2) east of the subject tract.

Conclusion -- Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning and land use patterns, the Staff cannot support the IR or IL request as it would be considered spot zoning, not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and therefore, recommend DENIAL of the application.

For the record, the Staff could support OL zoning if properly advertised which is a may be found in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #384

The subject tract is approximately 9.75 acres in size and located east of the southeast corner of 71st Street South and Elwood Avenue. It is partially wooded, steeply sloping, vacant, and has a companion Zoning Case (Z-6017) where the applicant is requesting IR or IL underlying zoning.

The Staff has reviewed the proposed development and cannot support the PUD since we cannot support the underlying zoning as it is considered spot zoning, not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL.

For the record, if any of the underlying zoning were to be approved and the PUD considered, the Staff would suggest that the following conditions be made part of the approval:

(1) That the applicant's revised Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

(2) Development Standards:

	Submitted	Suggested
Land Area: (Gross)	9.75 acres	9.75 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within an IR Industrial Research Dis-stict and including Use Unit 15, Other Trades and Services, Use Unit 23, Warehousing & Wholesaling, and Use Unit 25, Light Manufacturing.	As permitted within an IR Industrial Research District and Use Unit 15.
Floor Area Ratio:	.5	.31 (133,000 sq. ft.)
Maximum Building Height:	40 ft.	26 ft.
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	10%*	20%*
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Interior Street Centerline;	50 ft.	100 ft.
From 71st Street (From Section Line);	190 ft.	220 ft.
From East Boundary;	25 ft.	100 ft.
From So. & W. Boundaries:	50 ft.	100 ft.

*Required landscaped open space shall include the perimeter landscaping along 71st Street, but each lot shall contain not less than 5% landscaped area. Required landscaping shall include parking islands and plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

(3) The signs comply with Section 1130.2 (b) of the Tulsa Zoning Code and the following modified sign standards as submitted by the applicant:

Submitted:
Signs accessory to principal uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions.

Ground Signs:
For each principal building ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign identifying the building not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 64 square feet.

Wall or Canopy Signs:
Wall or canopy signs shall not exceed a display surface area of one square foot per lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed.

Entry and Expressway Signage:
In addition to other signage, a monument sign identifying the project not exceeding 20 feet in height nor exceeding

a display surface area of 120 square feet may be located at the principal entrance to the project.

Outdoor Advertising Sign:
In addition to the permitted accessory signage, outdoor advertising is permitted as follows:

Maximum Number of Signs:	1
Maximum Height:	35 ft.
Maximum Display Surface Area Per Sign:	672 sq. ft.

Suggested:

Ground Signs:
Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign identifying the building or buildings not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 64 square feet.

Wall or Canopy Signs:
Wall or canopy signs shall be limited to one sign for each principal building and shall not exceed a display surface area of one square foot per lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed.

Entry and Expressway Signage:
In addition to other signage, a monument sign identifying the project not exceeding 6 feet in height nor exceeding a display surface area of 120 square feet may be located at each of the two principal entrances to the project.

Outdoor Advertising Sign:
Permit an existing sign if nonconforming but no new signs.

(4) The on-site business activities, other than parking and loading, shall be conducted within enclosed buildings.

(5) The outside storage of or display of products or equipment offered for sale and the outside storage of any materials is prohibited.

(6) That a Detail Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, including elevations of all exterior walls showing the architectural treatment to be used.

(7) That a Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including a 6-foot screening fence and landscape buffering along the west and south property lines.

(8) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Z-6017 and PUD #384 (continued)

NOTE:
Any zoning pattern should not permit IL zoning to front 71st Street or extend to the extreme south or west boundaries of the subject tract.

Applicant's Comments:
Mr. Johnsen recapped his presentation to the Planning Commission of December 5, 1984, and advised he did not feel "residential" was a good use for this area because of the Jones Airport flight plan and he reiterated that this proposal was for a business park which he felt would be compatible with the airport. He advised the following modifications have been made to the original proposal: (1) There is a 100' setback on all sides from the boundary line; (2) south and west walls are now all brick with glass store fronts abutting the adjacent property; (3) floor area has been reduced from 150,000 square feet to 133,000 square feet; (4) there is now a 25' continuous landscaping area along the west and south boundaries which gives an aggregate of at least 20%; and (5) sign, parking requirements, etc. have either remained as in the original plan or have been increased. Mr. Johnsen further advised there would be no outside storage.

Mr. Johnsen informed this Use Unit would have permitted warehousing and manufacturing, but these uses have been deleted from this proposal. Under this proposal, Use Unit 15 would permit only trades and services and in an "IR" zoning area, scientific research would be permitted. Mr. Johnsen noted this proposal would still be subject to a final Detail Site Plan.

Protestants:		Addresses:	
	Jeff Nix, Attorney		1310 South Denver Avenue
	John Cuevas		R. R. #3, Box 773, Broken Arrow
	Mrs. Nancy Tips		7500 South Elwood Avenue, Tulsa
	Ms. Maxine Beall		310 West 71st Street
	Ken Robertson		Unknown

Protestants' Comments:
Mr. Nix advised he represents the protestants and was not present at the previous hearing on this proposal. He informed he had lived on the five acres of land west of the property and did not believe any changes should be made to the character of the Staff Recommendation for denial since this area is primarily an agricultural and residential neighborhood with established landowners. He felt this development would not be in the best interest of these owners. He also noted the only access to the proposed site is a City-owned road off 71st Street, which is the current access road to a City sewer facility and continued access to the site would be based on permission of the City of Tulsa. He also noted there are no existing sewer and water facilities on the site. Mr. Nix informed he had discussed the proposal with Mr. Johnsen but felt that it would still not be in the best interest of the residents.

Mr. Cuevas, accountant for one of the property owners, advised he was to have had a meeting with Mr. Johnsen at 9:00 a.m. today, but Mr. Johnsen was unavailable at that time and he had, therefore, been unable to discuss the proposal. He further advised he was concerned about a research facility and felt there was not enough detail presented in the proposal by Mr. Johnsen.

Z-6017 and PUD #384 (continued)

Mrs. Tips expressed concern about this type of property being located within an agricultural area where there has been little development.

Ms. Beall advised she lives within 200 feet of this property and expressed concern that building would create dirt problems. She noted she didn't know what would be built but that she understood this developer primarily builds mini-storage units.

Mr. Robertson advised he is the son of an individual who owns land next to the proposed site and questioned why the developer was opposed to "CS" zoning. He informed he felt "light industry" zoning kills the value of property and he advised he is in the construction business and he felt spot zoning hurts Tulsa. He noted he didn't know what research would be conducted at the site but was opposed to any type project which would be detrimental to the health of his father who has emphysema.

Interested Parties: Jerry Isaacs Addresses: 4104 South Atlanta Ave.
M. F. Allen 101 West 81st St. So.

Interested Parties' Comments:

Mr. Isaacs advised he has an interest in some land directly north of the property (NE corner of the intersection) and that his tract looks down on the subject tract. He said he had spoken with the other property owners to find out what type development was being proposed and he was pleased with the proposal. He felt this proposal was sensible and advised he felt this would be a quality development and would be an enhancement to the area. Ms. Wilson questioned what effect this would have on his side of the street and Mr. Isaacs informed he was comfortable with the delineations of "IL" and "IR".

Mr. Allen informed he owns 70 acres of land south of the southeast corner of this tract and he was for any development that would enhance the area and he felt this development would help the west side of town.

Other Comments:

Mr. Johnsen noted this area would not stay agricultural, but would be developed in some manner. He advised "IR" and "IL" zoning was selected because it would be restrictive and would allow for a PUD which would give the opportunity for development of safeguards and standards. In regard to Mr. Cuevas' comments concerning the project, Mr. Johnsen advised he had discussed the plot plans with Mr. Cuevas and Mr. Cuevas had advised he was undecided if he wanted to see them. In response to the comment regarding the possible building of mini-storage units on the site, Mr. Johnsen informed this type of structure would be excluded under the "IR" and "IL" zoning.

Ms. Kempe questioned if there would be pollution in conjunction with any research and Mr. Johnsen informed that anything of a toxic nature is precluded by the Zoning Code under this Use Unit.

Mr. Johnsen presented copies of the Site Plans (Exhibit "C-1"). Mr. VanFossen advised he supports this project. Ms. Wilson noted this area is included in the Turkey Mountain Study area and advised she is in agreement with the Staff Recommendation for denial. Commissioner Rice advised he supports "IL" and "IR" zoning with the restrictions imposed by "IR" and with the approval of the PUD.

Z-6017 and PUD #384 (continued)

Instruments Submitted: Site Plans and Elevation Plans (Exhibit "C-1").

Mr. VanFossen informed the Protestants that this is the only project that is to be approved and if the applicant returned and tried to do something else, this action would control.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present. Z-6017 & PUD #384

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-1-0 (Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be zoned IR and IL to conform, based on the amended pattern laid out by the applicant, and APPROVAL of PUD #384, subject to the Staff's suggested recommendations, as per the applicant's revised and amended conditions and elevations:

Legal Description for Z-6017; as submitted

Parcel A -- Begin 140' South of the NE corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; thence South 380'; West 208'; North 380'; East 208' to the Point of Beginning; and

Parcel B -- West 67.89' of the South 710' of the North 850' of the NE/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; and

Parcel C -- Begin 520' South of the NE corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; thence W. 660'; South 330'; East 660'; North 330' to the Point of Beginning; and

Parcel D -- Begin 208' West and 140' South of the NE corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; thence South 380'; West 210.26'; North 380'; East 210.26' to the Point of Beginning. (Needs to be revised)

Legal Description for PUD #384

Parcel A -- Begin 140' South of the NE corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; thence South 380'; West 208'; North 380'; East 208' to the Point of Beginning; and

Parcel B -- West 67.89' of the South 710' of the North 850' of the NE/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; and

Parcel C -- Begin 520' South of the NE corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; thence West 660', South 330'; East 660'; North 330' to the Point of Beginning; and

Parcel D -- Begin 208' West and 140' South of the NE corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 12 East; thence South 380'; West 210.26'; North 380'; East 210.26' to the Point of Beginning.

Application No. Z-6018 Present Zoning: RS-3
Applicant: INCOG Proposed Zoning: CS
Location: SW corner of 51st Street and 32nd West Avenue

Date of Application: October 31, 1984
Date of Hearing: November 12, 1984
Size of Tract: 135' x 104'

Remarks:

Mr. Frank advised INCOG has requested this item be continued until the Planning Commission Meeting of January 9, 1985 for readvertisement.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Young, "absent") to continue Z-6018 until the Planning Commission Meeting of January 9, 1985.

Application No. PUD 306-A Present Zoning: (RS-3, RM-1)
Applicant: Larkin (Grupe)
Location: South of the SW corner of 91st Street and Harvard Avenue

Date of Application: November 1, 1984
Date of Hearing: December 12, 1984
Size of Tract: 14.43 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Bill Jones
Address: 201 West 5th Street, Suite 400 Phone: 581-8200

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Major Amendment (notice required) which would remove a small portion of the area from the PUD. Area "B" is located south of the southwest corner of East 91st Street and Harvard Ave. and has a total area of 14.43 acres. This area was originally allocated 88 residential units under the approved PUD. For purposes of these discussions, Area "B" will be described as follows: Area "B-1" -- a portion of the tract located south of the Vensel Creek Tributary consisting of 5.83 acres with an allocation of 13 units under RS-2 standards; Area "B-2 -- a portion of the tract north of the Vensel Creek Tributary consisting of 7.25 acres with an allocation of 44 units which could be developed for single-family, single-family cluster, church use or some combination thereof; and Area "B-3" -- a triangular piece of property bounded on the west by the Vensel Creek improved channel and on the south by Area "B-2". The present zoning of Area "B-3" is RM-1 and the applicant is requesting that although the PUD be abandoned for this tract, that the RM-1 zoning be retained without the PUD requirements and development standards.

The amended standards for PUD #306-A are requested to be as follows:

	Use	Acres	Units
Area "B-1"	Detached single-family	5.8370	13
Area "B-2"	Church, single-family cluster, or low density multifamily.	7.2506	44
Area "B-3"*	Single-family, cluster, or low density multi-family.	1.3463	-0-
TOTAL		14.4339	57

*Retain RM-1 zoning and abandon PUD #306.

Considering that the applicant desires to retain the RM-1 zoning on Area "B-3", the total number of units allowed in Area "B" (88) should be reduced accordingly. Assuming that the average density for Development Area "B-3", presently zoned RM-1, was 23 units per acre, total units allocated to Area "B" should be reduced by 1.3463 acres x 23 units per acre. This indicates that 31 units should be deducted from the 88 total units, leaving 57 units allocated to Area "B", which is consistent with the applicant's request. Further, it appears more logical for the development of Area "B-3" because of its shape and location to be connected with development of the tract to the east and supports the logic of abandonment of the PUD for said Area.

PUD #306-A (continued)

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested major amendment, being PUD #306-A, in accordance with abandonment of the PUD for Area "B-3" and retention of RM-1 zoning, plus reduction of the total number of units from 88 to 57 for Area "B" with 13 units allocated to Area "B-1" and 44 units allocated to Area "B-2".

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bill Jones, attorney, informed the triangle portion of the plat is not usable for development by Grupe Company. Therefore, it is being deleted from the PUD and is being transferred to the "CS"/RM-1 tract next-door with the TMAPC lot-split hearing to be held December 19, 1984.

Interested Party: Mr. Evan Feenster Address: 9417 South Gary Avenue

Interested Party's Comments:

Mr. Feenster advised he owns property located in the RS-2 area which abuts the subject property and asked for clarification of what is being planned regarding this proposed site.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Gardner informed the original area had been proposed for 88 dwelling units. However, the area south of the creek and the area in which Mr. Feenster resides was permitted only conventional RS-2 development. At the time the PUD was approved the number of dwelling units was not specified; it was only specified that the land be laid out in RS-2 size lots. The applicant has since presented a preliminary plat with 13 lots which would be the number of lots available under RS-2 standards. The number of building units permitted on the proposed site would be arrived at by deducting 13 units from the 88 units available and by deducting the 31 units proposed for the triangular portion of land to be sold to the developer to the east. This would permit consideration of 44 dwelling units or consideration of a church. If a church is included, the number of dwelling units must be decreased in proportion to the site. The applicant must return with Detail Site Plans prior to development of the area.

Mr. Feenster advised his major concern is the drainage area. He informed the area had flooded twice since Grupe installed the drainage canal. He expressed concern as to who would be liable for the drainage renovation if the land was sold and requested that the liability for the drainage renovation be made part of the contract. Ms. Kempe informed the area has a Floodplain determination which requires on-site detention for development for 100-year storm sewer to Vensel Creek and must be worked out in the platting process.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to recommend APPROVAL of the following described property, requested as a major amendment, being PUD #306-A, to the Board of City Commissioners in accordance with abandonment of the PUD for Area "B-3" and retention of RM-1 zoning, plus reduction of the total number of units from 88 to 57 for Area "B" with 13 units allocated to Area "B-1" and 44 units allocated to Area "B-2" but amending the standard on Area "B-2" to state "church or single-family, cluster, or low density multifamily":

PUD #306-A: (continued)

Legal Description for PUD #306-A

Areas "B-1 and B-2":
A tract of land that is part of the NE/4 NE/4 of Section 20, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, Said Tract of land being described as follows:

Starting at the NE corner of Section 20; thence South 1°-08'-55" East along the Easterly line of Section 20 for 662.72' to the Point of Beginning, said point being the SE corner of the NE/4 NE/4 NE/4 of Said Section 20; thence South 1°-08'-55" East a distance of 662.73'; thence South 88°-40'-02" West for 795.19'; thence North 1°-19'-58" West for 111.49'; thence North 19°-23'-19" West for 119.28'; thence North 17°-50'-09" West for 272.02' to a point of curve; thence along a curve to the Right, with a Central Angle of 57°-35'-00" and a radius of 366.26', for 368.10' to a point of tangency; thence North 39°-44'-51" East along said tangency for 111.31' to a point of curve; thence along a curve to the left, with a Central Angle of 17°-14'-52" and a radius of 227.81', for 68.58' to a point of tangency; thence North 22°-29'-59" East along said tangency for 160.95' to a point on the Westerly line of the NE/4 NE/4 NE/4 of Said Section 20, said point being 205.32' Southerly of the NW corner thereof; thence South 1°-08'-12" East along Said Westerly line for 456.94' to the SW corner of the NE/4 NE/4 NE/4; thence North 88°-37'-38" East along the Southerly line of the NE/4 NE/4 NE/4 for 661.20' to the Point of Beginning, LESS and EXCEPT the following Area ("B-3") to be deleted from PUD 306:*

Area "B-3":
A tract of land, containing 1.3463 acres, that is part of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 20, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, Said Tract of land being described as follows, to wit:

*Starting at the Northeast corner of said Section 20; thence South 1°-08'-55" East along the Easterly line of Section 20 for 662.72' to a point, said point being the Southeast corner of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Said Section 20; thence South 88°-37'-38" West along the southerly line of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 for 661.20' to the "POINT OF BEGINNING" of Said Tract of land, said point being the Southeast corner of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Said Section 20; thence North 1°-08'-12" West along the Easterly line of Said NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Said Section 20 for 456.94'; thence South 22°-29'-59" West for 160.95' to a point of curve; thence Southwesterly along a curve to the right, with a Central Angle of 17°-14'-52" and a radius of 227.81', for 68.58' to a point of tangency; thence South 39°-44'-51" West along Said tangency for 111.31' to a point of curve; thence Southwesterly and southerly along a curve to the left, with a Central Angle of 29°-41'-22" and a radius of 366.26', for 189.79' to a point on the Southerly line of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Said Section 20; thence North 88°-37'-38" East along Said Southerly line for 256.24' to the "POINT OF BEGINNING" of Said Tract of Land.

NOTE: This tract is restricted from being transferred or conveyed as above described without including the NE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 20, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa,

PUD #306-A: (continued)

Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, unless the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, or its successors, according to law, approves such conveyance or transfer.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Jones requested and the Planning Commission authorized, by consensus, early transmittal of this portion of the minutes dealing with the removal of Area "B-3" from the PUD, retaining RM-1 zoning and reducing the total number of units allowed in Area "B" from 88 to 57.

Applications No. Z-6019 and PUD #385 Present Zoning: (OM)
Applicant: Jones (M & M Investments) Proposed Zoning: CS
Location: NW corner of 71st Street and Utica Avenue

Date of Application: November 1, 1984
Date of Hearing: December 12, 1984
Size of Tract: 1.7 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Bill Jones, attorney
Address: 201 West 5th Street, Suite 400 Phone: 581-8200

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-6019

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity -- Office.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the requested CS District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6019

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is about 1.7 acres in size and is located at the northwest corner of East 71st Street and South Utica Avenue. It is presently vacant, and basically level with a gentle slope from east to west towards Joe Creek. The property is presently zoned OM.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by an existing office building zoned OM with PUD #287, on the east across South Utica Avenue by the Southbridge Office Park with OM zoning, the Kingston Apartments south across East 71st Street with OM zoning, and on the west by the Joe Creek channel which is zoned RM-1 with the Lift Apartments on the west bank.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- The zoning pattern abutting the area of request has basically been for office and multifamily residential uses.

Conclusion -- Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning and land use patterns, the Staff cannot support the CS request for the entire tract as it is not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan; and therefore, recommends DENIAL of the CS application.

For the record, the Staff could support zoning a portion of the tract CS which did not abut East 71st Street, South Utica Avenue, and adjacent property to the north. This recommendation and discussion is presented in the Staff Recommendation which accompanies PUD #385.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #385

The subject tract is approximately 1.7 acres in size and is located at the northwest corner of East 71st Street and South Utica Avenue. The tract has a frontage on East 71st Street of about 150 feet and a frontage of about 503 feet on South Utica Avenue. The Joe Creek channel abuts this area along its western boundary. The area under consideration is presently vacant, and has a companion Zoning Case (Z-6019) where the applicant is requesting CS underlying zoning on the entire tract.

The Staff has reviewed the proposed PUD and is supportive of the proposal based on CS underlying zoning for only a part of the tract which does not abut adjacent developed and developing areas. The applicant proposes to develop within the requested project a single-story retail commercial building in which will be concentrated a full range of interior decorating services and product selections. This particular location is selected as the applicant believes there is a need in this part of Tulsa for these products and services. The subject tract has recently been platted with limits-of-no-access being imposed along the East 71st Street frontage. Access to the center would be from South Utica Avenue adjacent to the northwest corner of South Utica and East 71st Street.

The applicant's PUD Text indicates that no screening or landscape buffering is proposed along the west boundary which abuts Joe Creek and is open to view from the adjacent RM-1 multifamily residential area. It is believed that a requirement should be made to have this elevation of the building, and also the north building elevation, to be somewhat consistent with that of the east and south. Although the applicant's Text indicates no screening fence to be proposed for the west boundary, the Staff recommends a requirement for a 6-foot privacy fence to screen the loading areas, trash and other utility areas which will exist in this general area. A landscape buffer along this boundary would seem preferable to any screening fence requirement, however, the existence of the service drive precluded that option. It is further suggested that the service drive along the west and rear of the building be a minimum of 21 feet in width to recognize the need for access by large vehicles, for utility areas, and for trash areas.

The Staff recommends APPROVAL of the PUD with the indicated conditions and subject to the tract being zoned CS for only that portion described as the west 130 feet, less and except the south and north 50 feet. A similar underlying zoning pattern was approved west of the area of request on the south side of East 71st Street at the southeast corner of Trenton Avenue and East 71st Street for the Bridge Pointe Shops and Offices via PUD #304.

Given the above review and modifications, the Staff finds the proposal to be: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area, (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site, and (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the PUD subject to CS zoning on the west 130 feet of the subject tract, less and except the north and south 50 feet and the balance which will remain OM, and the following additional conditions of approval.

(1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

(2) Development Standards:

Land Area (Gross):	2.228 acres	97,054 square feet
(Net):	1.733 acres	75,473 square feet

	Submitted	Recommended
Permitted Uses:	Principal and Accessory uses permitted as a matter of right in a CS District as defined by the Zoning Ordinance on the date of filing the PUD.	As permitted by right in a CS District, excluding bars, taverns, nightclubs, dancehalls, and restaurants.
Maximum Building Floor Area:	25,049 sq. ft.	25,049 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height: (Exclusive of Mezzanines and Below Grade Levels of Floors)	1-story	1-story
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	111 spaces	1 space per each 225 sq. ft. of gross floor area and as per the Zoning Code.
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline of East 71st Street:	110 feet	110 feet
From Centerline of South Utica Avenue:	50 feet	50 feet
From West Property Line:	15 feet	21 feet suggested
From North Property Line:	25 feet	25 feet
Minimum Landscaped Area:	Not Specified	10%
Signs:	Signs shall be in conformance with the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.	Signs shall be in conformance with the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

(3) Trash and utility areas shall be screened so as not to be visible from ground level of adjacent residential areas and abutting development and a screening fence shall be installed along the west boundary.

(4) That a Detail Site Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit, that architectural treatment of the west and north building walls shall be generally compatible with the east and south walls.

(5) That a Detail Landscape Plan and Sign Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the TMAPC prior to occupancy.

(6) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary of said Covenants.

Z-6019 and PUD #385 (continued)

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Jones informed a decorator center is being proposed for this site with no planned access off 71st Street. He advised the Southbridge Office Condominium Association had enlarged the exclusions of uses permitted on the site. He advised he had several problems with the Staff Recommendations: (1) If a solid wooden fence was erected next to the creek as recommended by the Staff, it would be difficult for the City and the Corps of Engineers to maintain the creek. He advised under his proposal a landscaping screen would be planted in the back of the structure but requested this item be left open until approval of the Detail Site Plan. (2) The Staff Recommendation excludes a restaurant and the cocktail lounge, but these uses would be allowed under Use Unit 14. (3) Condition #6 of the Staff Recommendation is that the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code be satisfied and Mr. Jones informed this area had just been replatted and he suggested the Deed of Dedication be amended to satisfy this requirement. Mr. Gardner informed a Restrictive Covenant is needed to show this requirement has been satisfied and Mr. Jones advised this would be done. (4) Mr. Jones advised he had a problem with putting a percentage on landscaping prior to submittal of the landscaping plan and advised he would like to leave this item subject to the landscaping plan.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. VanFossen advised he would like to put controls on the elevation and noted he did not find limitations on lighting on the west side of the building. He further advised he would like to limit the height of the building to 24'.

Mr. Gardner advised if the restaurant was permitted, the parking requirement, per the Zoning Code, would need to be added.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present. Z-6019

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be zoned CS:

Legal Description Z-6019

The West 130 feet of Lot One (1), Block One (1), LAURENWOOD, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, less and except the North 50 feet and less the South 50 feet thereof.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present. PUD #385

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be APPROVED as recommended by the Staff but amended as follows: Change the statement under permitted uses to "as permitted by right in a CS District, excluding tavern, dancehall, motion picture theatre, nightclub, sexually oriented business (as presently defined in Section 750 of the Tulsa Zoning Code), liquor store, bar (except bar or cocktail lounge used in conjunction with a restaurant), cafeteria, garden supply store, pawn shop, building materials store, coin operated, self service laundromat, gasoline service station, any Use Unit 19 use as presently set forth in the Tulsa Zoning Code. Under maximum height of buildings, change

maximum height from "one-story" to "24 feet". Under minimum parking, change "in lieu of "one space per 225', etc." to "per the Zoning Code". Under Item #3, add the following right after "screening"; "between screening and fence or landscape screening as approved by the Landscape Plan". Add condition #7, "No lighting shall exceed the height of screening fences on the west and north properties":

Legal Description PUD #385

Lot One (1), Block One (1), Laurenwood, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

PUD #306 -- Early Transmittal

Mr. Jones requested early transmittal to the City Commission, of that portion of the Minutes of this meeting dealing with the triangular portion which was to be deleted from PUD #306.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to APPROVE early transmittal of the minutes of this meeting dealing with the triangular portion of land to be deleted from PUD #306.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #370 SW corner of 106th Street South and Memorial Drive

The applicant was present but did not wish to comment.

Staff Recommendation -- Detail Site Plan Review:

This PUD is located at the southwest corner of 106th Street South and Memorial Drive. The total area of the PUD is approxiately 10 acres with elderly and multifamily housing and a park proposed on the west portion, and a church use proposed on the approximately east 450 feet. The applicant is requesting Detail Site Plan review and approval of the east tract for the proposed church use only at this time.

The applicant has indicated two access drives from the parking lot to 106th Street South. The location of these drives causes vehicles entering or exiting the parking lot to swerve sharply to miss vehicles in the parking spaces on the parking corridor which lies parallel to the front of the building. The location of these spaces (two at each end of the parking corridor) causes them to be in the driveway. It is recommended that the points of access to 106th Street South be directly aligned with parking drives within the parking lot for improved circulation and to avoid a potentially hazardous condition. Further, the east/west drive in front of the building narrows from 26 feet to 20 feet in front of the main church building entrance. It is recommended this drive be a consistent width of 26 feet and the traffic island causing this obstruction to be reduced by six (6) feet in width.

The size of the existing church sanctuary is assumed to be 2448 square feet which would be consistent with earlier information submitted with the PUD materials. This would indicate that the proposed number of parking spaces, 62 spaces, is adequate and in accordance with the Ordinance. All parking spaces shall be required by the Zoning Ordinance to be 9' x 20' for standard cars and 7 1/2' x 15' for compact cars. The plan indicates two (2) handicapped parking spaces adjacent to the northeast corner of the sanctuary. The south space must be protected by a radius and curb extension to avoid the situation where cars which are parked there, would protrude into the drive.

The plan submitted for review indicates two small buildings located west of the main church building that were approved under the PUD as temporary buildings, although, they were not indicated as temporary on the plan. A condition of approval of PUD #370-1 was that these buildings be removed prior to completion of any construction on the site beyond Phase I which is understood to be the initial sanctuary buildings and supportive facilities only. The need to remove these buildings is also reinforced by the fact that they encroach on the required 190-foot setback from the west boundary, which would be acceptable, but only on a temporary basis. The buildings are located 145 feet from the west boundary. Each building is 24' x 24' or 576 square feet in size. All other setbacks for the initial and future construction are indicated to have been observed by the plan.

"Limits-of-No-Access" is indicated on the plat for that frontage of the church development area along Memorial. It is therefore vital that the timely and ultimate improvement of 106th Street be secured as a condition of approval of the Detail Site Plan as this street is the only access to the development.

Therefore, with the above changes and conditions of approval as discussed, the Staff could find the Detail Site Plan for the church site only to be: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a part of the conditions of approval, unless modified herein.

(2) Development Standards: Church Area Only

Land Area (Net):	±130,685 sq. ft.	±3.0 acres
Permitted Use:		Church
	Submitted	Approved by PUD
Maximum Building Height:	Not stated	35 feet
Maximum Building Area of Sanctuary:	2448 sq. ft.	2448 sq. ft.
Minimum Parking Requirement:	62 spaces	62 spaces
Minimum Building Setback:		
From Centerline of Memorial Dr.	150 feet	150 feet*
From Centerline of 106th Street	115 feet	90 feet*
From South Property Line	40 feet	40 feet
From West Boundary	220 feet**	190 feet

No Detail Site Plan approval is requested at this time on the residential development, and therefore, future development on this portion of the site will also require Detail Site Plan approval, and such additional development standards shall be included in the Restrictive Covenants.

*The setbacks indicated are as approved under PUD #370-1 for future construction. Setbacks for the initial construction meet or exceed the approved minimums.

**This setback is measured from the west boundary to the permanent building, although, a lesser setback of 145 feet is shown for temporary buildings which is acceptable as a temporary condition and subject to these buildings being removed prior to completion of future construction.

(3) That all requirements of the appropriate agency or department in the platting process be met unless a waiver is approved by the TMAPC; provided, however, that the collector street be stubbed to the west so that it can be tied to the existing street when the property owner to the north plats his property.

(4) That signage shall meet requirements of Section 1130.2 (b) of the Zoning Code.

PUD #370 (continued)

(5) That parking isles and circulation, including points of ingress and egress from 106th Street, be redesigned to provide continuous lanes of circulation, unobstructed by parked cars, with uniform isle widths, and curbs be installed and extended to protect parked cars as at the northeast corner of the main church building for the handicapped parking spaces.

(6) That in accordance with recommendations from the City Engineering Department, that no occupancy be issued prior to completion of engineering plans in connection with required P.F.P.I. for improvement of 106th Street (secured by an irrevocable letter of credit, for a term of not more than five (5) years).

(7) That a Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy.

(8) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and submitted and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants and the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of DRAUGHON, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to recommend APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan for the church portion of PUD #370, subject to the conditions recommended by the Staff.

PUD #199-5 Lot 8, Block 14 of Whispering Meadows:

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment

The area of request for the minor amendment is Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows, also known as 2904 South 121st East Place. According to the Protective Inspections Department, the permit was issued for a 20-foot front building line and the present encroachment (see attached survey) was discovered during construction.

The existing encroachment causes one corner of the garage to be only 15.5 feet from the property line. Due to the shape and location of the lot, the structure in its present location will not appear to be closer to the street than adjacent and abutting residences to the south. The subject tract is abutted by a large detention area on the north where no structure will be built.

Therefore, the Staff has reviewed this request and determined it to be minor in nature and recommends APPROVAL of the requested minor amendment to change the front building line from 20 feet to 15.5 feet for Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows Addition, also known as 2904 South 121st East Place.

PUD #199-5 (continued)

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to APPROVE the minor amendment as recommended by the Staff to change the front building line from 20' to 15.5' for Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows Addition, 2904 South 121st East Place.

PUD #357-A Valley Bend Shopping Center--Buildings A, B, C and D

Staff Recommendation: Detail Site Plan Review.

The PUD is located south and east of the southeast corner of 71st Street and South Quincy Avenue. It is irregularly shaped, and has a gross area of 8.48 acres -- 5.55 acres dedicated to Shopping Area and 2.93 acres dedicated to Office Area. The subject tract has underlying zoning of CS on the north 350 feet, RM-1 on the balance, and PUD. The applicant has requested review of only the Shopping Area portion of this PUD at this time. It should be noted that buildings previously approved as Buildings "A" and "E" have now been combined into a new Building "A", and some changes have been made in building areas as noted below, however, total Shopping Area of the center remains unchanged at 51,735 square feet.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Detail Site Plan, underlying zoning, past PUD approvals, and find the proposal to be: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan for the Shopping Area (Buildings "A - D"), subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the applicant's Plans and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

(2) Development Standards:

SHOPPING AREA--BUILDINGS "A, B, C AND D"

Land Area (Gross): 5.55 acres
(Net): 5.03 acres

	Approved/PUD	Submitted
Permitted Uses:	As permitted in a CS District	Same
Maximum Floor Area:	51,735 sq. ft.	51,735 sq. ft.
Buildings "A & E", New Building "A",	5,597 sq. ft.	6,616 sq. ft.
Building "B"/Restaurant	8,600 sq. ft.	8,600 sq. ft.
Building "C"	19,960 sq. ft.	19,960 sq. ft.
Building "D"	17,578 sq. ft.	16,559 sq. ft.
	7,488 sq. ft. Restaurant	7,485 sq. ft. Restaurant

PUD #357-A: (continued)

Maximum Building Heights:	1-story	Not stated--1-story Maximum Permitted.
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	15% of Net Area	Not stated--15% of Net Area Required.
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline of 71st St.	125 feet	134 feet
From Centerline of S. Quincy	60 feet	66 feet
From Other Boundaries	10 feet	11.5 feet min.
Parking Ratio:	1 Space Per 225 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area of Retail; and,	Same
	1 Space Per 100 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area for Restaurant.	Same
Total Spaces:	319	327
Spaces by Size:*		
Standard Size	227	241
Handicapped	12	12
Compact	80	74
Spaces by Uses as Required:		
Shopping	158	158
Restaurant	161	161
Loading Berths/Buildings:		
"A" & "E" or New "A"	2	None Specified**
"B"	2	None Specified**
"C"	2	None Specified**
"D"	2	None Specified**
Other Bulk and Area Requirements:	As required within a CS District.	Not Specified***

*Minimum Parking Space sizes shall be as follows:
Standard Size - 9 feet wide x 20 feet long, and
Compact Size - 7 1/2 feet wide x 15 feet long.

**Loading Berths shall be provided per the Zoning Ordinance.

***Bulk and Area Requirements shall be in accordance with the requirements of the CS District.

(3) Sign Standards:

Signs accessory to the shopping area uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Ground Signs:

Ground signs shall be limited to one ground sign identifying the project or tenants therein located at the 71st Street entrance to the project not exceeding 20 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 120 square feet, and one monument sign identifying the project at Quincy entrance not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 64 square feet.

PUD #357-A (continued)

Wall or Canopy Signs:

Wall or canopy signs shall be limited to 1 1/2 square feet of display surface area per lineal foot of the building wall to which affixed.

Signs accessory to the office area uses shall be limited to one monument sign identifying the project to the Quincy entrance not exceeding 4 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 32 square feet.

(4) Trash storage areas and utility areas shall be screened from the public view.

(5) That the architectural character of the east side of Buildings "B" & "C" in the shopping area be consistent with the fronts of said buildings.

(6) That the Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including a screening fence shall be constructed along the exterior boundaries of the project where they abut any R District and along the Quincy frontage the required screening shall be a combination of screening fence, berms, and landscaping.

(7) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Randy Heckenkemper, representative of Poe & Associates, advised this was a review of a proposal which had been discussed at an earlier Commission meeting and noted the back of Building "A" was treated per the requirements of the PUD which had already been approved by the Commission. He also noted a 6' screening fence would be installed behind Buildings "B" and "C" per the requirements of the PUD.

Mr. Heckenkemper advised the backs of Buildings "B" and "C" had been addressed in the original PUD but Building "A" had not been addressed because of its abuttment to a commercial site.

Mr. VanFossen advised this proposal did not appear to be in compliance with condition #15 of the Staff Recommendation since the backs and fronts were not of the same basic configuration. He advised he was, therefore, opposed to the proposal.

Mr. Heckenkemper requested that this item be continued to the next Planning Commission hearing to allow for modifications by the architectural firm.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to continue consideration of PUD #357-A until Wednesday, December 19, 1984, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

CJ-84-6248 Southland Association vs. City of Tulsa

Presentation:

Mr. Wilmoth informed this is a request from the Legal Department for input or recommendation by the Planning Commission in regard to vacating portions of 41st Street and South Yale Avenue (Major Street and Highway Plan requires 60' from centerline of both streets). If the City vacates this portion of easement, it would leave 50 feet of right-of-way on Yale; however, the Major Street and Highway Plan requires 60' of right-of-way from the centerline on both Yale Avenue and 41st Street since they are primary arterial streets. He advised this area is zoned CH and was not subject to a plat. He further advised that although there is a 30' surplus of easement, the Southland Association is requesting more which would leave less than 60' for the easement.

Mr. Linker advised the Legal Department is requesting the Commission's comments on this suit for its presentation in the suit with the Southland Association.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Kempe and Mr. VanFossen noted they did not understand how this land would be used and requested clarification as to what was being requested of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Gardner informed there is a request before the City Commission to vacate the right-of-way held by the City and the City is asking for comments of the Planning Commission in regard to this right-of-way. He advised that Commissioner Metcalfe, Commissioner of Streets and Public Properties for Tulsa, was present to explain this proposal.

Commissioner Metcalfe advised he had been contacted by Mr. Joe Francis, attorney for the new owner of Southland Shopping Center, and vacation of the easement was being requested to allow for the development of a new parking garage and other improvements at the center. This would assure the new owners and its financiers that parking space would be permanently available for customers of the center. He noted the City Staff, City Engineering Department and Water and Sewer Department had no problems with modification of the Major Street and Highway Plan in this particular instance.

Mr. Draughon questioned if the City would be compensated for this land and Commissioner Metcalfe advised the City was researching how the land had been acquired and, assuming the City had paid nothing for the acquisition, he would recommend to the other Commissioners that this proposal be allowed without any additional compensation from the owner.

Mr. VanFossen noted if the right-of-way was returned, it would be permanently a part of Southland since it would be required for parking as part of the financing package.

Mr. Connery noted it was possible these streets could be 3-laned sometime in the future and there would be a problem obtaining the right-of-way at that time.

Mr. VanFossen advised he could see returning the right-of-way back to the 60' easement, but felt that returning more than that would set a precedent which could result in future problems for the City.

Mr. Draughon advised that if the City would have to continue maintaining the utilities, etc. the Southland owners would be deriving all of the benefits and was against returning the right-of-way.

Commissioner Rice requested that these comments be conveyed to Commissioner Metcalf in writing.

LOT SPLIT FOR WAIVER:

L-16309 Bill Lee (883) South and East of the SE corner of 72nd Street and Columbia Avenue (RS-1)

Staff Comments:

Mr. Wilmoth advised the applicant was present and informed this is a request to split a 2.2 acre tract into four lots with a private mutual access easement handle to 72nd Street.

In discussion the Technical Advisory Committee had questioned if 20' was being split from Lot 4 which is in the PUD (Rockwood Hills Pond) if so, this reduces that lot to 90' and it may not comply with the PUD. There were other questions regarding drainage and how it would be served with water, sewer and other utilities. The T.A.C. unanimously recommended this item be tabled for additional information needed to process the application.

The applicant had already scheduled the hearing before the Board of Adjustment on November 29, 1984. That hearing was held and the Board approved the request, subject to the Planning Commission approval of the lot split. The applicant has obtained the necessary approvals of the T.A.C. members since the T.A.C. meeting and is now requesting approval.

The question regarding 20' of Lot 4 in Rockwood Hills Pond has been resolved. This was an access to the existing house south of 72nd Street and this lot split will not affect the PUD or that plat. The existing house will have access through the mutual access easement as platted and as approved by the Board of Adjustment. The PUD is not affected.

The Staff and Technical Advisory Committee recommended approval of the split subject to the following:

(a) Mutual access documentation for the record,
(b) utility easements as needed for service, and
(c) grading and drainage plan approval by the City Engineer (applicable in the building permit process).

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Young, "absent") to approve the request for waiver of frontage for lot split L-16309, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Mutual access documentation for the record,
(b) utility easements as needed for service, and
(c) grading and drainage plan approval by the City Engineer

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Date Approved January 2, 1985

Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

R B Paddock
Secretary

12.12.84:1534(30)